


SMITH'S REPORT

On the Holocaust Controversy

N° 126 www.Codoh.com April 2006



Supporting "The Campaign to Decriminalize World War II History"

FAURISSON UNHAPPY WITH HOW SMITH WRITES ABOUT JEWS

THE CAMPAIGN TO FORCE NORTHWESTERN TO FIRE ARTHUR BUTZ

SMITH ENCOUNTERS A PROBLEM WITH THE "OBVIOUS"

Robert Faurisson reacts forcefully to the column I printed in SR 125. I try to explain my position, unsuccessfully. At Northwestern, Hillel, students, and faculty, including the Department of Religion, denounce Butz. No one supports him. How the "obvious" came to capture my imagination. The issue of "world views." A new column for the student and off-campus press. Brief updates on Zundel, Verbeke, and Toben.

I'm going to get into a difficult matter here, it may ruffle a few feathers, but it's a matter that I find interesting and important. I believe most of you will be interested in the subject, though you might disagree with me. Holocaust revisionists and Jews have a special relationship with one another. There is a lot of frustration, anger, denial (no pun intended), and mistrust on both sides. And that is the crux of the matter—for me, there is no "side." That's what is difficult to make clear.

In February I submitted a column to the student press titled "Why are we making this power-mad extremist look so good? (referring to Iranian president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad—I printed it in *SR 125*)." It was published in two campus newspapers that I am aware of. The first was in

"The "Daily Hornet" at California State University at Sacramento, the second in "The University News" at DePuaw University, a rather elite Christian campus in Indiana.

The last week in February I heard from Robert Faurisson, who had read the column as it was printed in "The Daily Hornet." He was very direct in his criticism of how I had written about Jews. The core of his concern was:

"You are careful to totally exonerate the Jews. You go on repeating: "It's NOT the Jews, NOT the Jews, NOT the Jews."

It's true, I did use that phrase, though in specific contexts. Briefly, I wrote that revisionism is where it is, and revisionists are where we are, not because of how Jews behave, but because of the synchronicity of how Jews and those of us

who are not Jews behave together.

Several readers expressed their support for that point of view. One reader called me from England to tell me he thought it "beautifully written" (thank you, Tom)—if I understood him correctly. He called very early in the morning and my head was still full of night slush.

Faurisson was very direct in his criticism of what I wrote. He doesn't beat around the bush. During the 25 years we have been friends he has been just as direct in his encouragement of my work, and sometimes with his praise of it. The directness of language you will find here is what I expect from him.

Following then are excerpts from Faurisson's comments on my column, followed in turn by my observations on the issue he raises. Then I will turn to the

story about Arthur Butz at Northwestern, a consideration of the "obvious" in what I write, and then an enigmatic comment on the affair by Ted O'Keefe.

FAURISSON: "*Ordinary stupid people would think that ... Jews are responsible [for the persecution of revisionists]. But, thanks to Bradley Smith, we can see that in fact, Bush is responsible. Not the Jews. The same, of course, for our prisoners. The American, Canadian, Dutch, German and Austrian governments are responsible. Not the Jews. French Police, Justice, Universities, Media made Faurisson's life impossible. Not the Jews.*"

[...] the letter you got published in *The State Hornet* on February 13 [is a] shameful or gaga letter in which you went on repeating that, if revisionists are prosecuted and persecuted in USA, Canada, Germany, France and elsewhere, it is because of the Bush administration, the CSIS, the European states, etc, but **NOT THE JEWS, NOT THE JEWS, NOT THE JEWS.**

[...] I consider that, when a Bradley Smith comes and ... says what you have been writing in that newspaper, it boils down to claiming: *'The criminals are NOT our masters, our tyrants, i.-e the Jews, but all those who are obeying those tyrants and masters. And look precisely at your words.'*

[...] You are careful to totally exonerate the Jews. You go on repeating: *"It's NOT the Jews, NOT the Jews, NOT the Jews"*.

There was considerable back and forth not included here. I thought my responses made it so perfectly clear as to what I was getting at that I didn't even bother to go back to the column to read what I had written there. Maybe I had, after all, written something

and had forgotten that I had written it. I've been known to do that. Considering the time-honored concept that late is better than never, at least sometimes, I decided to re-read the column.

It didn't make any difference. What I found is that I did write, three times, that it was "not the Jews," that it was "not the Jews," that it was "not the Jews." Each time I wrote that phrase it appeared in a specific context, each context being different.

I wrote: "*[It] is not the Jews (sic) who are imprisoning people who question the official history of the Holocaust in the West. The truth is, those responsible for the laws that make Holocaust revisionism a crime are those officials who hold office in Western Governments, a tiny minority of whom are Jews.*"

This is simply the fact of the matter. I do not argue that Jews *do not want* to see revisionists censored and jailed. I do not argue that Jews *do not push* for the censorship of revisionism. I do not argue that Jews *do not push* for the criminalization of revisionism, and I do not argue that Jews *do not push* for the imprisonment of revisionist writers and publishers. Jews are up to their necks in this business from the get-go

Nevertheless, it is obvious that those who write the criminal codes, those who ratify them, those who pass judgment on revisionists, and those who enforce those judgments—are all employees of the State, here and abroad. Among that number are what, I suppose, is a tiny minority of Jews. Tiny. I'm willing to be convinced that I am wrong about this. But I believe it is obvious. That is the fact of the matter.

I wrote: "*In 2005 alone, the laws against holocaust denial in*

France were used by the government, not the Jews (sic), to prosecute political opponents on both the left and the right."

This statement is either true or it is not true. The percentage of those who hold office in the French Government, from top to bottom, are overwhelmingly not Jews. This is true, or it is false. I don't know the numbers. I'm speculating. But it appears to be an obvious fact.

I wrote: "*When Iranian President Ahmedinejad blames the Jews for laws against Holocaust skepticism, none of those government officials who actually wrote and enacted, who actually enforced those Laws, not one, steps forward to say, 'No it was not the Jews (sic). It was me and my government colleagues.'*"

This statement is either true or it's false. How many State factotums in France or Germany have in stood up to make the matter clear? One? Who is she? I'd very much like to meet her.

In short then, it is *not the Jews* who imprison revisionists, *not the Jews* who pass the laws criminalizing revisionism, *not the Jews* in France who prosecuted opponents of the State under "denial" laws. Jews do push for all those things. Those of us are not Jews, that is the overwhelming majority, comply with what is requested of us.

It is only human for revisionists to be angry with Jews, Faurisson in particular, but Zundel, Rudolf, Verbeke, Porter and how many others? All punished under laws created and enforced by those of us who are not Jews, at the behest of the tiny minority of Jews who live among us. Is this not so?

Jews have behaved very badly in all this. Nothing is clearer. Nevertheless, those of us who are not Jews have gone along with Jews

when we could have chosen to act with honor, stood on principle, and insisted on the truth. However, we are who we are.

In short then, my view is that what Jews want is a Jewish problem. How those of us who are not Jews respond to what Jews want is our problem. If Jews are responsible for what they do, and Jews are responsible for what those of us

who are not Jews do, what are we responsible for? Nothing! Are we to behave as children before a stern and grasping parent? It's as if we have no shame.

That's the point of view that I was trying to get across to Robert. It's not always "them." Sometimes, oftentimes, it's "us." And that it is more appropriate and more honorable to take responsi-

bility for our own failures and correct them, than it is to complain about the successes of the others.

It is clear in my mind that I did not "totally exonerate the Jews." I didn't totally exonerate them in my column, and I will not totally exonerate them here. Just as I will not totally exonerate those of us who are not Jews. What's right for the gander, is right for the goose.

ARTHUR BUTZ AND THE SCANDAL AT NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

Here is the primary statement by NEVER AGAIN, a group originated by Northwestern Hillel.

NEVER AGAIN

Sign the Never Again Petition

The Holocaust was a crime against humanity.

Declaring the Holocaust a hoax is an insult to mankind, and a rejection of universally-held historical truth. As an academic institution committed to training moral and enlightened global citizens, Northwestern University cannot accept the propagation of hateful lies.

For too long, Holocaust denier Arthur Butz has used his professorship at Northwestern as a credential to spread his agenda of anti-Semitic falsehood. His association with Northwestern is an embarrassment. His words and actions have outraged and upset students and faculty of all backgrounds.

We therefore insist that Northwestern enforces its staff policy:

"Demeaning...behaviors that affect the ability to learn, work, or live in the University environment depart from the standard for civility and respect. These behaviors have no place in the academic community." -Staff Handbook (47)

We the undersigned, ask that the Northwestern community take decisive action to sever the name of our university from Arthur Butz's bald denial of history.

We call for the following punitive actions:

Immediate termination of Arthur Butz's Northwestern-hosted website space.

Immediate implementation of measures to ensure that students may easily avoid taking courses with Prof. Butz.

A signed statement from the University faculty, published in the Daily Northwestern, repudiating Arthur Butz.

We promote adoption of the following educational initiatives:

An annual Holocaust and genocide awareness day, sponsored and observed by the University.

The establishment of Northwestern as a leading institution for the study of the Holocaust and genocide.

We look forward to the resignation of Arthur Butz and the day when he is no longer a stain on the reputation of our university

Select the appropriate category to sign the petition:

Everything about this very public statement is ugly. The ignorant sliming of Arthur Butz, and the mindless obsession with protecting the ugly myth of the gas chambers, which includes by definition the charge of unique monstrosity against the Germans. Thousands have signed the petition, mostly Jews. Dozens of organizations have signed it, mostly Jewish. Of those at Northwestern who are not Jews, and those organizations that are not Jewish, either sign the petition or remain silent about it. What's new?

I decided to look into the numbers at Northwestern. There are some 2,500 faculty. A good number are Jews, certainly. For the sake of argument, I am going to say that half are Jews. I don't believe it for a minute, but let's use that figure for the sake of argument. This suggests that at Northwestern there are more than ONE THOUSAND faculty who are not Jews.

Of those 1,000 faculty at Northwestern who are not Jews, there is not one who has stood up for Butz and made the simple observation that it has not yet been demonstrated that in his Hoax, Butz is wrong about anything. ONE THOUSAND faculty on that campus who are not Jews but there is only one who will say publicly that he does not believe in the genocide of the Jews, does not believe the gas chamber stories, and does believe that the beginning of the mess it had a "Zionist provenance."

Jews at Northwestern behave with some honor. They stand up for what they believe in. They are wrong about the Holocaust. They are wrong about intellectual freedom. They are wrong about the role of the university in the West. Even though they are in the minority at Northwestern, and in Amer-

ica, and in the West, they stand up for what they believe (discounting the hypocrites and frauds which are part of every societal group).

The idea that those academics at Northwestern who are not Jews are "terrorized" (as Faurisson has it at one place) is not a statement about Jews. It is a statement about those of us there who are not Jews. What form exactly does our "terror" take? Do we feel faint at the thought of being criticized by a Jew? Oh, my! Slandered by a Jew? Unbearable! What a pathetic bunch of pansies. "Us"—not "them."

I do not exonerate Jews for their role in the Holocaust scam. Today, they play the dominant role in it. They do so because those of us who are not Jews have let them have their way with their story, and with us. We have evaded our responsibility to be forthright, to expose the fraud and falsehood in the story, and to tell the truth as we see it. We have been greedy with our lust for Jewish money and influence, we have been lazy, and we have been fools. We have made a pact with our own devils to go with those who push the hardest, no matter what they are pushing for, rather than with those who deserve fairness and justice.

We are not slaves to the Jews. We simply behave like moral sloths. Those poor academics at Northwestern U are perfect examples, the little darlings. Afraid of being bad-mouthed at a cocktail party, afraid of losing a career promotion, afraid of being ridiculed, afraid of this, afraid of that, afraid of their own shadows until they have reached that place where they will betray any man, any principle, and every professional responsibility. The poor babies at Northwestern are there in the hundreds, and only one dares to challenge the fraud-soaked history of

the Germans and Jews during WWII.

Sorry. It's not the Jews. Rather, it is the Jews, but it is us too. Jews and revisionists inextricably linked until we decide to agree on what really went down between the Germans and the Jews during WWII, and what has come of it. It isn't going to happen anytime soon, particularly in light of how "we" behave when "they" challenge us.

THE ISSUE OF "WORLD VIEWS"

There are two world views at play here. Each has a legitimate point of view. One focuses on the bad character of "the other." The second is focused on the weaknesses and bad character of "himself." Personality has a lot to do with this, as well as the drift of the life that one has lived. It's the old issue of "nature" verses "nurture."

I do not see that it is either one or the other, but a play between the two. I doubt that world views are entirely consciously chosen. We come to them like we come to our wives and husbands, via fortuitous circumstances that we cannot predict, and that are rooted in an immeasurable number of incidents since time immemorial. In the end, we are who we are, and we don't know very much about it.

This is not by any means a complete review of all the issues raised by Faurisson's reaction to what I wrote about it being "not the Jews." It's a start. Maybe I can be convinced that I am wrong about any or all of it.

If only ten of the pansies on the Northwestern faculty who are not Jews—ten out of ONE THOUSAND—were to behave honorably and speak out in defense of Butz, that would be a start. But that's really too much to ask from those of us at Northwestern who

are not Jews. We have one guy there. That appears to be it.

Shoot me if I'm wrong.

Meanwhile, sometime after I submitted the February column to the student press, it occurred to me that I would like to ask Arthur Butz a question. He's not the sort to chat with the likes of me, so I kept it brief. Did he agree that the Holocaust story was institutionalized at Nuremburg by the Allied Governments, who had all the power, not the Jews? Guys like Josef Stalin and Harry Truman, the Hero of Hiroshima?

Butz replied that if I were asking who was "morally responsible," the Allied Governments were. He added that the observation was "trivially obvious." I replied that I agreed. It was obvious.

Nevertheless, the words "trivially obvious" hung around in the back of the brain for a couple, three days, like some dark little cloud of bad fumes. It wasn't "obvious" that hung around, but "trivially obvious." One day I realized that every Holocaust issue I have addressed over the last twenty-five years has been so "obvious" as to be trivial.

It is obvious to me that free men and women want the "inalienable" right to say what we think, how we feel. Obvious that we believe a free press is more valuable to free men than a censored press. That some "survivor" testimony is true, while some is false. That Germans and Jews are both human beings and each should be treated as such, not just Jews. That academics have to be held responsible for their actions just like those of us who didn't go to school.

These matters are so obvious to me that, from a certain perspective it can be said to be trivial to even note them. Yet that is what I do. It is all I do. I write about the obvious. The more obvious it is,

the more I write about it. As a matter of fact, I write only about those matters that appear obvious to me. When there is something I don't understand, I make it plain, obvious that is, that I do not understand it. I find the absence of fact to be about as interesting as facts themselves. Each can be liberating, and each can be devastating.

I have nothing whatever to say that is new. I have never had an original thought in my life. It is very far from being original with me, for example, to believe that I should clear the mote from my own eye before I make an effort to remove it from the eye of the other. I think it obvious that I should do that. Why? It would take a book. At the same time, it is perfectly obvious to me that I cannot demonstrate that I am right.

The more obvious a matter is, the more mysterious it becomes, in that not all others see it as being obvious. So we will want to be careful with one another. Especially, as revisionists, with Jews. Those of us who are not Jews have a responsibility for Jews. They need our help in a very special way.

Those of us who are not Jews should stop telling Jews that we believe everything they say about Germans. We need to encourage Jews to question the authority of those Jewish organizations that police Jews. Jews are exploiters and beneficiaries of the Holocaust Industry, but they are also among its victims. If that were not so, Jews would not be hated today, and held in so much contempt, by so many others in so much of the world. Who is hated more? It's obvious. No one.

One afternoon I decided to walk to the mail drop, something like a two-mile round-trip. I'm walking along the Boule-

vard, keeping my eye on the broken and torn up sidewalks, when it occurs to me that I have not heard from Ted O'Keefe for some time. I have my cell phone with me. Cell phones are wonderful little miracles of modern technology. I pull it out of its case on my belt, which Paloma gave me for my birthday last month (the case), and ring him up. In only a moment there he is on the other end of the horn.

Still walking along I tell him about the back and forth I am having with Faurisson. O'Keefe is troubled by it. I tell him not to worry. Faurisson will forgive me. I tell him about Butz and his words "trivially obvious." I begin talking and don't want to stop. I go through the whole Faurisson affair, then the Butz observation, and then I make a leap I had not yet made.

I am not only a writer who address what is most obvious about the Holocaust taboo, but when I write the personal journals and stories, I write only about what is most obvious in my life. Trivially obvious. That is my *métier*. If it isn't obvious, I don't write about it. I don't wonder about the secrets of the universe, I stand in awe of obvious secrets. If I am asked a question about heaven or hell, or where man came from, I say I don't know. It's obvious that I don't know, and there is nothing more obvious—to me. My entire life is devoted to what is obvious. No mystery, no philosophy, no imagination, no invention, nothing new, no break throughs. I was on a roll.

After a while O'Keefe said:

"I think you're taking too much credit for yourself."

"What?" It was as if my mind went blank. Mexicans say the mind goes "white."

"I think you're taking too much credit," he said. The tone of

his voice suggested that he was not particularly interested.

"Too much credit for what? What does that mean?"

At that moment one of the ladies who owns the mail drop appeared at the glass door to their shop with her keys in her hand. I told Ted the mail drop was closing. I had to go. We said goodbye, and that was it. In the mail there was one check for \$40, and three multi-page, multi-colored flyers from natural healers selling supplements

guaranteed to solve my prostrate problem. There are twenty or thirty doctors and alternative healers around the U.S. who demonstrate what to me is a suspicious interest in the condition of my prostrate.

A couple three of these twenty or thirty guys (they're all men) are Jews. If push comes to shove regarding my prostrate, would I want one of "them" messing with "mine?" Considering the work I do? It would probably be alright. I'd have to think about it.

That was yesterday. Today I'm still thinking about O'Keefe saying that I am taking too much credit for going on about how I write only about the obvious. I don't understand what he was getting at. Maybe I kind of half get it. I don't know. His words "too much credit" are drifting around inside the skull like a dark little fog. It's drifting around in there very, very slowly.

NEW OPINION PIECE FOR PRINT PRESS

We have sent the following Op-Ed to student and mainline press. The language is very carefully written. We want to publish in mainline campus papers and in city dailies, not small special interest publications with tiny audiences. Again, we'll see.

HOW CAN YOU ADVOCATE FREE SPEECH TO DENY THE HOLOCAUST?

Bradley R. Smith

16 March 2006

It is commonplace for students and others to ask: "With Germany's historical record, how can you advocate free speech to deny the Holocaust? Isn't Germany merely preventing another Holocaust from happening? The answer is not complicated."

There is little doubt that Germany and Austria have their laws in place because they fear, if not another Holocaust, then at least another period of fascist leadership, similar to the National Socialist period. However much such laws may have been valid in the immediate postwar period, they are counter-productive now, for at least two reasons, and are moreover illogically founded.

The first reason the laws are counter-productive is that they inhibit the ex-

change of information. History shows that whenever an elite attempts to control information, it breeds resentment and conspiracy theories about "the thing that is hidden." It is shortsighted for any government to ban speech about something as transparently innocuous as discussions about the historical past.

We might want to revise that slightly, with a nod to the other side. Many supporters of the traditional Holocaust story, and many Jews, are convinced that anyone who speaks or writes about the inaccuracies in the Holocaust story is fostering anti-Jewish sentiment, because Jews will be blamed for the inaccuracies. In this way, so the argument goes, Holocaust revisionism is hate speech. This may be true under

some circumstances, and we can provide an example of the kind of statement that might concern them, such as "The gas chambers of Auschwitz were a fiction created by Zionists to extract money", which, according to standard definitions, is a clear-cut expression of Holocaust "denial."

Yet there are two things going on in that statement. The first is a statement about Auschwitz, the second is a statement about Zionists and, presumably, Jews. Under current laws, the first part of that statement alone would, ostensibly, be a crime. That is the problem. The second part of the statement, concerning Zionists, may or may not rise to the level of hate speech, but it is certain that in the minds of many Jews it will be perceived as such.

It would be best for the civic health of Germany and Europe for both statements to be covered by freedom of speech laws. But if, in fact, the laws are really meant to prohibit the second half of that statement, then they should be explicit on that score, so that free speech advocates would at least know what they are struggling against.

A good example could be given that indicates the actual mind-set of the Germans and Austrians. A few years ago a German historian named Fritjof Meyer wrote an article, and a lengthy rebuttal that was, in its essential points, indistinguishable from the position of David Irving, who is now serving a lengthy prison sentence in Austria for Holocaust denial.

For example, Meyer claimed in his article that the death toll at Auschwitz was in the low hundreds of thousands, that the famous 4,500 deaths-per-day memo was a forgery, and that none of the crematoria were used for gassing inmates.

However, Meyer also cloaked his observations with suitable track-backs to Holocaust mavens like Robert Jan van Pelt, and with a pious and regretful meditation on the crimes done to the Jewish people, at Auschwitz and elsewhere. In other words, objectively speaking, Meyer "denied the Holocaust." However, Meyer suffered absolutely no punishment whatever. From this we

conclude that the crime of Holocaust denial, as it exists on the statute books in Europe, is sometimes less about the substance of what one says, but rather about the form and means used to express it.

The above example points to the other reason why the laws against Holocaust revisionism are counter-productive. If the authorities are concerned about a rebirth of Nazism, then they should simply say so. If they are concerned about a rebuilding of anti-Jewish sentiment, then they should say so. On the other hand, by criminalizing any open discussion of the Holocaust they are actually encouraging, rather than

discouraging, the growth of a corrosive suspicion and fear that the governments of Germany and Austria are dominated by foreign, and perhaps Jewish, interests, which in their turn will also foment hatred.

Legal regulation of opinion always fails, precisely because "Thoughts are Free": they will not obey stop signs or attempts to tell them what to do. Removing these barriers on freedom of thought and expression in Europe is the best way for the circulation of long-repressed opinions and doubts, and the surest way to ensure the softening of extremist opinion on either side of the political spectrum, as it rubs shoul-

ders with the mass of common sense which is the center of gravity for all social peace.

Thus the solution is, in some ways, a paradox: the best way to stop Neo-Nazism is to allow it. The best way to stop hate speech is to ignore it. And the one certain way to ensure the probability that there will be no more Holocausts is to not pass laws against thinking about them, or discussing them.

*Bradley R. Smith is
co-founder of*

*Historians Behind Bars
www.historiansbehindbars.com*

UPDATE ON ERNST ZUNDEL From Ingrid Rimland

Email 15 March 2006: The trial in Mannheim has been postponed again - this time indefinitely. So far, in 6 or 7 hearing days, all the time was taken up with questions about protocol and about whether or not Ernst's attorneys might not be as politically correct as is expected - only the charges were being read. There will not be another trial date for 3 or 4 weeks.

We are now treating Ernst's arrest and deportation as a bona fide extrajudicial rendition - in other words, a political kidnapping, as it should have been dealt with all along. We are justified in doing this because we are in the possession of some 150 lbs (!) of Freedom of Information Act documents, many on official letterhead, that show clearly that three (possibly four) so-called "democratic" states were involved at the highest level in criminalizing and then railroading one man into incarceration whose only "weapon" was his old-fashioned fountain pen.

*Ernst Zündel
J.V.A. Mannheim
Herzogenriedstrasse 111
D-68169 Mannheim
F.R.G. / BRD [Germany]*

SIEGFRIED VERBEKE: From His German Prison

Siegfried Verbeke has not been in the news the way Zundel and Irving have been. But the 63-year old Belgian has been the head of the Free Historical Research Center since 1983. He was one of the first people that Germar Rudolf turned to when Germar "discovered" revisionist arguments. Verbeke is a printer by profession. He played a key role in printing revisionist books in Europe, while helping to build Germar's German-language Vrij Historisch Onderzoek (VHO) Web site.

Verbeke was arrested last August time at Schiphol Airport in Amsterdam, as he was about to fly to Manila. A German judge had issued an international arrest war-

rant against Verbeke at the end of 2004 for "casting doubt" on the internet about the six million. Germany asked Belgium to extradite Verbeke last year but a Belgian judge refused the request.

Verbeke had already been convicted in Belgium of denying the Holocaust. The appeals court in Antwerp sentenced him in April 2004 to a maximum one-year jail term and a 2,500-euro fine for anti-racism laws. And so it goes.

[Edited] 27 February 2306

Dear Bradley and family: I have been in jail here since 09 August 2005, or seven months. The prison here looks medieval. The building dates from 1865. Every morning I expect to see Hussars of Frederick the Great ride by.

Life is hard here. Isolation for 23 hours each day, no phone, no visits, correspondence censored, and of course no woman! Nevertheless, you get used to it.

I have been thinking. You and I are a lot alike. You were a bookseller, you went broke, and so did

I. You like wine, you like to write, and I do too. We both had a humble youth. We both have very religious life companions. You took care of an aged mother, you are not religious but you are tolerant. That's me. We worked hard—I was careful with money. I think we are different there. We seem to have something of the same kind of brain, we love literature, and we are both willing to take chances. That's a lot in common. No?

I don't know when I will be free. There is now word of a second accusation. Let's hope that it will not become a series of accusations like what happened to Udo Walendy and Gunter Deckert.

Wishing to be with you on the veranda, drinking white wine.

Siegfried Verbeke #207
J.V.A. Oberer Fauler Felz 1
D-69117 Heidelberg
F.R.G. / BRD [Germany]

GERMAR RUDOLF

There is nothing new of consequence on Germar. I hear from him about once a month. This is his mailing address. Mention my name.

Germar Rudolf
JVA Stuttgart, Asperger Str. 60,
D-70439 Stuttgart
F.R.G./ BRD [Germany]

FREDRICK TOBEN FLIES TO IRAN TO LECTURE ON THE HOLOCAUST

Toben flew from Adelaide Institute in Australia to Iran in early March to fulfill three lecture dates. He was accompanied by an engineer, Richard Krege, who I am not yet familiar with, and a large scale, table-top model of Krema 2 at Auschwitz. The schedule looked like this:

Sunday, 5 March 2006 – Islamic Azad University - Mashhad: 16.00 - 19.00 hours

Monday, 6 March 2006 - Ebnesina Medical University - Mashhad: 16.00 - 19.00 hours

Tuesday, 7 March 2006 - Ferdowsi University - Mashhad: 09.30 - 12.00 hours

The talks were given under the general rubric of:

LECTURES ON THE "HOLOCAUST" Fact or Lie?

Richard Krege, using his Krema 2 model, covered the following points:

1. Daily life in the camps.
2. Dispelling rumors of secrecy concerning camp life.
3. Demonstration of Auschwitz-Birkenau Krema II model and its failings.

All this information is available on Toben's Website at www.adelaideinstitute.com There you will find photographs of Toben and Krege arriving in Iran, and photos of each of the lectures including the audiences of men and women, usually (always?) segregated. It appears to have been quite a performance.

THE FUNDING ISSUE

Last month I reported on an increasingly unhealthy financial situation, the primary problem being that I had to get rid of \$2,400 in borrowed debt ASAP. I want to thank those of you who responded. I was able to keep up with ongoing expenses and reduce the \$2,400 number to \$800. It ain't perfect yet, but the new number sounds a lot better to me than the other one.


Your contributions help me take care of business, and are the only funds I have, other than social

security, to take care of the household. You each have your own households to take care of, I understand that. But I am willing to wager that nearly every one of you chose a more mature way to ensure that you could do that than I did. Holocaust revisionism? Smith, you gotta be crazy.

Again, thanks for what you did for me last month. If you can, if you will, do it for me again this month, I would expect to be cured for the foreseeable future.

NEXT MONTH

SR 127 will go to the printers a week or so late next month. Don't worry. I will have a real good story to tell you when I get back. Until next month then.



Bradley

Smith's Report

is published by
Committee for Open Debate
Ont the Holocaust
Bradley R. Smith, Director

For your contribution of \$39 you will receive 12 issues of
Smith's Report.
In Canada and Mexico--\$45
Overseas--\$49

Correspondence & checks to:

Bradley R. Smith
Post Office Box 439016
San Ysidro, CA 92143

Telephone: 619 203 3151
Voice: 1 619 685 2163
T & F: Baja, Mexico
011 52 661 61 23984

Email: **NEW**
bsmith@prodigy.net.mx

On the Web:
www.Codoh.com